

[All Posts](#)

Subdeacon Nektarios, M.A. · 2 days ago · 21 min read

# In Preparation for Union with Rome: The Apostate Confession of Metropolitan Nathanael of GOARCH

Subdeacon Nektarios, M.A.

On August 27th, 2025, at the New Calendarist ‘church’ of Saint Anargyroi, the pseudo-bishop “Metropolitan” Nathanael (Symeonides) of the apostate Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America (GOARCH) delivered an ecumenical speech entitled “The 1700th Anniversary of the Council of Nicaea,” in which he gave a thoroughly heretical confession of faith against Holy Orthodoxy and put on full display his ecumenist groveling before Papist Cardinal Robert Barron—very much in line, of course, with the rest of the teachings of this apostate and graceless patriarchate.



To begin his ecumenist groveling before Cardinal Barron, Symeonides acknowledged this heterodox clergyman not only as a legitimate bishop of the Church of Christ, but even went so far as to call him a “Brother in Christ”—despite the Papists’ adherence to countless heresies condemned by Holy Orthodoxy through the Scriptures, the Saints, the Fathers, the Ecumenical Councils, the Canons, and the liturgical texts and in the same sentence says to his audience of clapping seals that he wished the Papist Cardinal would have been his dogmatics professor so that he could have learned so much more.[1] Is this how supposedly Orthodox bishops speak of heterodox clergy—that they desire to learn more heretical teachings from those who openly profess foreign and corrupt doctrines? Is this what Saint Mark of Ephesus did when he stood before these very same Papists at the Council of Ferrara-Florence, defending Holy Orthodoxy with unwavering boldness?

Symeonides begins his heretical confession of faith by declaring that the First Ecumenical Council of Nicaea is “unfinished business,” as though the Fathers of that holy council had somehow left loose ends unresolved. With heretical boldness, Symeonides proclaims:

I would like to offer and focus our attention on certain contemporary challenges, or perhaps more accurately, the unfinished business of Nicaea, and to consider how these matters continue to shape the life and witness of the Church today.

I speak of Nicaea’s unfinished business because it is all too easy to regard the great First Ecumenical Council solely as a glorious milestone of Catholicity and Orthodoxy, a triumphant achievement of the past, yet one that poses no urgent challenge for our churches today. We may imagine that all was definitively settled at Nicaea, that the controversies it addressed are long behind us, and that our only task now is to commemorate its memory.

But Nicaea is far more than a majestic monument preserved in the annals of church history to be studied, admired, and celebrated from afar. It is a living witness whose voice still speaks, whose truth still shapes the Church’s faith, and whose call still defines her mission.

This timeless vitality of Nicaea is evident not only in the theological clarity the Fathers established but also in their pastoral concern. In this way, the Fathers unequivocally demonstrated that right belief (orthodoxia) and right practice (orthopraxia) are inseparably bound together. Indeed, the enduring legacy of Nicaea is that it held in harmony the four great pillars of the Church: faith, morals, order, and liturgy. It offers both inspiration and challenge for our own age, a pattern to be imitated and a standard to be upheld.

Even now, I see it calls us to receive its witness not as a relic of the past, but as a living summons to embrace the fullness of our Christian vocation with renewed resolve and steadfast humility.

In what follows, I will briefly reflect on the interplay between orthodoxia and orthopraxia, taking Nicaea as our guide. Setting aside for the moment the question of the *Filioque*—technically an addition to the article of the Creed on the Holy Spirit, which was expanded at the Second Ecumenical Council—Nicaea remains the luminous hallmark of our common Christian faith.

Yet on the level of orthopraxia, we must ask: what is the value of affirming the shared faith if our churches persist in division? Such division, dear friends, is nothing less than a deep and grievous scandal—one that urgently summons us to seek concrete and faithful paths toward healing and true unity [2].

We need to pay particular attention to the last two statements of Symeonides, as they are significant points that must be addressed. First, this pseudo-bishop and false teacher urges you to set aside the issue of the heretical *Filioque*, condemned by countless Fathers of the Church, but most importantly by the Eighth Ecumenical Council of Constantinople, convened by Saint Photios the Great in 879, which specifically anathematized anyone who added to or subtracted from the Nicene Creed.

Second, consider Symeonides' language when describing the churches that are divided from one another. He does not say that the Papists are in schism from the Orthodox; rather, he claims that both are in schism and that both require "paths toward healing and true unity" [3].

Does this not seem deeply problematic? What Symeonides is effectively saying is that the Orthodox Church is equally in schism with the Papists, and that the Orthodox must feel equally guilty for this division. The Orthodox are expected to feel guilt for the Papists' adoption of doctrinal heresy and their separation from the Church of Christ? The Orthodox Church is supposed to bear guilt for the Papists' rejection of the Eighth Ecumenical Council of Constantinople after two hundred years of accepting it [4]?

The framing of this narrative—that both sides are in need of repentance because both are guilty of schism—is typical of the apostate bishops of the Ecumenical Patriarchate and its Greek Orthodox Archdiocese in America. Ask yourself: is this truly what the Orthodox Church teaches—that both are equally guilty? To answer this, and show how utterly ridiculous this is we can turn to the text of the Eighth Ecumenical Council of Constantinople (879 A.D.) and to the Orthodox Confession of Faith by Saint Mark of Ephesus, who defended Orthodoxy at the Robber Council of Florence, where bishops, very much in the same spirit as Symeonides, capitulated and willfully subordinated themselves to the level of apostate Uniates.

The Eighth Ecumenical Council in its ruling that was governed by the Holy Spirit decreed concerning any subtraction or addition to the Holy Creed the following:

Jointly sanctifying and preserving intact the venerable and divine teaching of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, which has been established in the bosom of our mind, with unhesitating resolve and purity of faith, as well as the sacred ordinances and canonical stipulations of his holy disciples and Apostles with an unwavering judgement, and indeed also the preaching of the seven holy and ecumenical Councils which were directed and actualized by the inspiration of the one and the same Holy Spirit, and honouring and jointly preserving with a most sincere and unshakable resolve the canonical institutions inviolate and unfalsified, we expel those whom they removed from the Church, but we embrace and regard worthy of reception those whom they declared as deserving honor and sacred respect as being men of the same faith or even teachers of piety. Thus believing and thus declaring regarding these things, we embrace with mind and tongue and declare to all people with a loud voice the Definition of the most pure faith of the Christians which has come down even to us from the beginning through the Fathers, subtracting nothing, adding nothing, changing nothing, falsifying nothing; for subtraction and addition, when no heresy is stirred up by the ingenious fabrications of the evil one, introduces condemnation of the uncondemnable and an inexcusable assault on the Fathers, but to change with falsified words the definitions of the Fathers is much worse than the foregoing. Therefore, this holy and ecumenical Council, embracing with divine longing and uprightness of mind the definition of the Faith that was from the beginning and considering it divine, therein also founding and erecting the firmament of salvation, is of this mind and cries out to all to proclaim:

I believe in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the only-begotten, begotten of the Father before all ages, Light of Light, true God of true God, begotten, not made, of one essence with the Father, by whom all things were made. Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven and was incarnate of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary, and became man; And was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered, and was buried; And rose again on the third day according to the Scriptures; And ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father; And shall come again with glory to judge the living and the dead: of whose kingdom shall there be no end.

And in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the Giver of Life, Who proceeds from the Father, Who with the Father and the Son is worshipped and glorified, Who spoke through the prophets.

In one holy, catholic and apostolic Church. I confess one baptism for the remission of sins. I look for the resurrection of the dead and the life of the age to come. Amen.

Thus, we believe; into this confession of the Faith were we baptised; through it the word of truth has shown every heresy to be shattered and destroyed. Those who are of this mind we call brothers and fathers and fellow heirs of the heavenly commonwealth. But should someone dare to compose another exposition besides this sacred Symbol, which has come down even to us from our blessed and sacred fathers, and call it a Definition of faith, and thus steal for himself the dignity of the confession of those divine men and enfold it with his own inventions, and set it forth as a common lesson to the faithful or even to those returning from some heresy, and be so audacious as to utterly adulterate with spurious words or additions or subtractions the antiquity of this sacred and venerable Definition, in accordance with the decree that has been declared already before us by the holy and ecumenical Councils, if he be one of the clergymen, we subject him to complete defrocking, and if he be of the laymen, we defer him to the anathema.

After the reading, the present sacred concourse cried out, “Thus are we all minded, thus do we believe, into this confession were we baptised and vouchsafed the priestly rank. Them who are otherwise minded, in violation of these things, we regard as enemies of God and of the truth. Should someone dare to compose and set up another Symbol besides this one or to add or subtract and be so bold as to declare it a Definition, he is condemned and cast away from all Christian confession. For to subtract or to add is to portray as imperfect the confession to the holy and consubstantial and undivided Trinity, which has been from the beginning to this very day. It convicts the apostolic tradition and the doctrine of the fathers. Should therefore someone arrive at such an end of mindlessness as to dare, as has been said above, to set up another Symbol and call it a Definition, or to make either an addition or a subtraction in the one handed down to us from the holy and ecumenical first great Council in Nicaea, let him be anathema [5].

Is the Eighth Ecumenical Council of Constantinople (879 A.D.) at all unclear in anathematizing anyone who adds to or subtracts from the Creed? Absolutely not. This infallible council, guided by the Holy Spirit, made its proclamation unmistakably clear.

We can now turn to Saint Mark of Ephesus and his Orthodox Confession presented at the Council of Florence. In his confession, Saint Mark declares not only that the *Filioque* is a heresy, but also that Orthodox Christians must break communion with any heretic who preaches another gospel, such as Symeonides. In the fifth paragraph of his lengthy doctrinal confession against the *Filioque*, Saint Mark proclaims:

Therefore, according to the decree of this Council, as well as the Councils before it, considering it necessary to preserve the Sacred Symbol of Faith unaltered, just as it was issued, and accepting what they accepted and rejecting what they rejected, I will never receive into communion those who dare to add a novelty to the Symbol concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit, as long as they persist in such innovation. “For whoever is in communion with those excommunicated from communion,” it says, “let him also be excommunicated” [6]. And the divine Chrysostom, interpreting the words (of the Apostle): “If anyone preaches to you a gospel other than what you have received, let him be accursed,”—says this: “He did not say if they preach something contrary or entirely corrupt, but even if they preach something small in addition to what you have received, or perhaps alter anything—let him be accursed.” And there he also says: “Moderation is necessary, so that the law is not violated.” And Basil the Great, in his “Ascetic Rules,” says this: “To reject something that has been written or to introduce something unwritten is a clear departure from the faith and a sign of arrogance; for our Lord Jesus Christ says: ‘My sheep hear My voice’ ; and before this He says: ‘They will not follow a stranger, but will flee from him, for they do not know the voice of strangers.’” And in the “Letter to Monks,” he says: “If some claim to profess sound faith, yet nonetheless maintain communion with those of different opinions, if they do not cease this after admonition, it is necessary to consider even them as not only excommunicated but also cease to call them brethren.” And before him, Ignatius the God-bearer, in his letter to the divine Polycarp of Smyrna, says: “Anyone who speaks beyond what is established, even if he is worthy by faith, even if he fasts, even if he maintains virginity, even if he performs signs, even if he prophesies, let him be to you as a wolf in sheep’s clothing, working to the destruction of the sheep.” And what need is there to say more?!—All the Teachers of the Church, all the Councils, and all the Divine Scriptures urge us to flee from those of different opinions and to withdraw from communion with them. Therefore, shall I, disregarding all of them, follow those who, under the guise of false reconciliation, call to enter into union with those who have violated the sacred and divine Symbol and introduce the Son as a second Cause of the Holy Spirit? For the rest of their absurdities, of which just one would be enough to break off from them, I leave at this moment unmentioned. May it never happen to me—O Good Comforter!—May I never depart so far from myself and from sound judgment, but having Your teaching and the teaching from men inspired by You, may I join my Fathers, carrying with me from here, nothing else but Orthodoxy (την ευσέβειαν) [7]!

Further in this ecumenist speech, Symeonides once again argues that these divisions arise from a mutual schism, implying that both sides are equally guilty, rather than stating the Orthodox truth: that the Papists themselves have adopted multiple heresies and have refused to repent of them. This pseudo-bishop and false teacher goes so far as to claim that “the greatest failing is not simply our inability to unite, but our indifference, our hesitation, or even refusal to embrace wholeheartedly the sacred calling to live in unity, rooted in truth and grounded in the love of Christ” [8].

In his lecture, Symeonides attempts to portray the workings of the Council—where many Arian heretics were returned to the Church—as comparable to the present heretical ecumenical movement. He presents their joint prayers, heretical ecumenical services, and groveling political platitudes toward the entrenched Papist heretics as if these acts could somehow bring them back to Holy Orthodoxy.

Symeonides further rejects Orthodoxy’s rigorous commitment to doctrinal unity, proclaiming to the crowd, “the struggle for unity and true Orthodoxy continues to this very day. In this ongoing journey, we must always remember that unity is not to be confused with uniformity” [9].

In saying this, Symeonides distorts Orthodox teaching. He asserts that unity for its own sake—as if this were what the Orthodox Church teaches—is more important than maintaining doctrinal integrity. In effect, he treats the doctrinal differences between the Orthodox and the Latin Papists as irrelevant, placing the appearance of concord above fidelity to the truth of the faith.

To further drive this heretical point home, he invokes the teaching of the late Pope Francis, who was widely regarded even within his own Roman Catholic community as a heretic departing from the doctrinal norms of Roman Catholicism. Symeonides presents this extraordinary heretic as an example to follow, stating:

As Pope Francis poignantly noted, the different theological, liturgical, spiritual, and canonical traditions that have developed in the Christian world, when genuinely rooted in the apostolic tradition, are a wealth for the Church and not a threat to its unity. Building on this insight, Pope Leo XIV invites us to view the anniversary of Nicaea as an invaluable opportunity to emphasize that what we have in common is far stronger—both quantitatively and qualitatively—than what divides us.

Despite these encouraging declarations, we must not remain complacent. As Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew reminds us, much work remains to reestablish the bond of communion, a task that continues to challenge us because it denies the perfect fraternity to which we aspire. The division of Christians is a scandal for the Church, for there is no true witness to the Gospel except in the unity of the members of the Body of Christ. Like the rigorous Nicaeans of old, some among the faithful in our two churches—and your Excellency, you know them, I know them, bishops—resist these and similar exhortations of our present spiritual leaders. To them we say, we embrace you with love but earnestly plead that you do not follow the treacherous path of Marcellus of Ancyra.

Though outwardly a champion of Nicaea, he was ultimately led astray by the evil one and by prideful, arrogant, and deceptive thoughts that cloud the heart and mind. If we fail to heed this warning, we risk the very fate of Marcellus and Arius, being expelled from the Catholic Church [10].

Here, Symeonides preaches that the Orthodox Church should heed the words of the Papal heretic, Francis, while simultaneously attempting to impress upon the laity that they should not defend doctrinal integrity and uniformity. To do so, he warns, would supposedly lead them down the path of Marcellus of Ancyra and into heresy. In other words, he is advocating that the faithful take his word unquestioningly, follow the bishops blindly, and ignore all blatantly heretical teachings he promotes.

Symeonides continues in his heretical speech, turning to two additional topics: clerical celibacy and the date of Pascha. Concerning clerical celibacy, he states,

The Council of Nicaea offers enduring wisdom on the question of clerical celibacy. The testimony of St. [Paphnutius] of Nicaea defending the ancient practice of ordaining married men reminds us that this issue has deep roots and a complex history that require careful and prayerful discernment.

This aspect of Nicaea's legacy invites us to approach contemporary pastoral challenges with humility, openness, and a genuine willingness to learn from one another's traditions. In this spirit, the Orthodox and Roman Catholic churches are invited to engage in fraternal and shared exploration of how church discipline might be rightly harmonized to promote both unity of practice and holiness of life within the Church today [11].

Again, we must ask: why would it be important for the Orthodox Church to explore the topic of clerical celibacy when the First Ecumenical Council long ago established the canonical norms for it? Why should we be interested in the Papal innovations concerning clerical celibacy? The answer is clear: we should have no interest in the heretical innovations introduced by the Papists.

The more likely reason this issue is raised by Symeonides is because the Arch-Heresiarch of Constantinople recently broke with Orthodox Tradition—and with the very canons of the First Ecumenical Council—by allowing a divorced priest in the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America to marry a previously married woman with children [12].

Concerning the date of Pascha and the Church calendar, Symeonides once again dismisses Orthodox tradition, instead turning the matter into a joke. He shows no concern for the Church's tradition or the proper observance of the Church calendar, because he and his heretical patriarchate have adopted the New Calendar. At this point, their only concern is celebrating the feast alongside those who are entirely outside of Holy Orthodoxy. Symeonides states:

Finally, one of the most urgent pastoral concerns related to the legacy of Nicaea—especially felt by families living in the West—is the question of how we calculate the date of Easter.

You know, we Orthodox, we struggle with this one because we say we want to do it on the same day with everyone, with all the Christians, but we enjoy the perks that come with having Pascha celebrated after the Catholics and the Western Christians. We get the discounts on everything. We get the bunny and the candies, the Peeps, and all that stuff [13].

Symeonides does not care about restoring Orthodox unity or abandoning the New Calendarist innovation introduced by his heretical patriarchate under Patriarch Meletios Metaxakis, a known Freemason. Instead, he is fixated on uniting with the Latin Papists, who created the Gregorian calendar—explicitly rejected by the Orthodox Church in multiple synods (see *The Calendar Question* by Fr. Basile Sakkas). This pseudo-bishop would rather pursue union with the Papists and concelebrate a common Pascha with them, despite their synodal condemnation by the Eighth Ecumenical Council and the testimony of innumerable Fathers of the Orthodox Church. As he himself confirms in his speech: “The 1700th anniversary of Nicaea offers us a providential moment to renew our efforts toward restoring a common date for Easter” [14].

He continues his theme of “Nicaea's unfinished business” by praising the heretical ecumenical movement that grew in prominence during the 1960s with the non-canonical lifting of the anathema against the Latin Papists. This act led Mount Athos—once a stronghold of Orthodox purity—to rightly break communion with, and cease commemoration of, the heretical Ecumenical Patriarchate. Symeonides further praises the ecumenical initiatives of the 1970s and 80s, the very same period when Saint Philaret of New York issued his three sorrowful epistles condemning this heretical movement. Yet, despite these warnings, Symeonides now glorifies the same path. Continuing on, he teaches the following:

Above all, let us commit ourselves to the ongoing work of our joint ecumenical endeavor for reconciliation.

To this end, alongside the lofty dialogue of charity that began in 1960 through 1980, in the dialogue of truth that began in 1981 and continues to this present day, in which our churches have long been engaged, perhaps we can embark on a third dialogue, the dialogue of holiness.

And this dialogue won't be championed by theologians and bishops, but it can be championed by the faithful of each and every parish around the world [15].

Symeonides continues his lengthy speech by once again invoking the heretical teachings of Pope Francis and then going even further into apostasy by recognizing John Paul II (1920–2005)—another heretical pope—as a saint along with a litany of other Latin Papist pseudo-saints who were known for their delusions and outright demonic influence. In his praise of both Francis, John Paul II and the other demonic pseudo-saints, he declares:

Pope Francis beautifully captures the essence of how the dialogue of holiness between Orthodox and Catholic Christians may be expressed. The Pope often quotes Saint John Paul II, and he writes: “Holiness is the most attractive face of the Church, but even outside the Catholic Church, and in very different contexts, the Holy Spirit raises up signs of His presence which help Christ’s followers. Saint John Paul II reminded us that the witness to Christ, borne even to the shedding of blood, has become a common inheritance for Catholics, Orthodox, Anglicans, and Protestants.”

In the moving ecumenical commemoration held in the Coliseum during the Great Jubilee of the year 2000, he stated that the martyrs are a heritage which speaks more powerfully than all the causes of division.

Brothers and sisters, through a dialogue of holiness, every member of the Church can contribute to the reconciliation of our divided churches. This dialogue does not weigh ordination, theological degrees, or rhetorical skills. It simply calls each of us, clergy and laity alike, to look with reverence upon the saints whom the Holy Spirit has raised up across our histories.

Many are venerated in both of our traditions: Mary, the holy Virgin Mother of God; the Apostles; the great Fathers; and the ecumenical teachers of the Church, while countless others are still only known and more cherished in one Church than the other. The dialogue of holiness encourages us to naturally draw life from the saints we hold in common, but then challenges us to search and be inspired by the holy ones that we have yet to discover.

Great lights such as Francis and Clare of Assisi, Catherine of Siena and Bridget of Sweden, Ignatius of Loyola and Teresa of Avila, Thérèse of Lisieux and Teresa of Calcutta, Gregory Palamas and Sergius of Radonezh, Seraphim of Sarov, and Nicodemus the Hagiorite, Nektarios of Aegina and Maria of Paris, Paisios the Athonite and Sophrony of Essex—each in his or her own way has borne the light of Christ to their generation.

Drawing closer to such holy men and women, we begin to sense that holiness itself is a language older and deeper than our divisions. To kneel at their icons, to read their words, to follow their footsteps in prayer and love is to find that we are already walking side by side with Christ [16].

What is most striking in this section of his heretical speech is his acceptance of these pseudo-saints as “holy ones that we have yet to discover.” These Latin Papist figures are not truly holy, and many of them were demonically influenced, as affirmed by numerous Fathers of the Orthodox Church. For example, Saint Ignatius Brianchaninov writes concerning Francis of Assisi:

When Francis was caught up to heaven, says a writer of his life, ‘God the Father, on seeing him, was for a moment in doubt to as [sic] to whom to give the preference, to His Son by nature or to His son by grace—Francis.’ What can be more frightful or madder than this blasphemy, what can be sadder than this delusion [17]!

In this speech, Symeonides curiously mentions both Catherine of Siena and Bridget of Sweden, who are strangely associated with the demonic so-called “Holy Foreskin” veneration within the Latin Papist tradition. Considering the multitude of pseudo-Papist saints he could have referenced, it is ironic that he mentions these two simultaneously, both of whom are connected to this demonically influenced veneration. Catherine of Siena, in her own letters, writes:

Now thus I tell thee, dearest my daughter, that I want thee to do. And be for me a mirror of virtue, following the footsteps of Christ crucified. Bathe thee in the Blood of Christ crucified, and so live, as is my will, that thou nor seek nor will aught but the Crucified, like a true bride, bought with the Blood of Christ crucified. “Well seest thou that thou art a bride, and that He has wedded thee and every creature, not with a ring of silver, but with the ring of His Flesh. O depth and height of Love unspeakable, how didst Thou love this Bride, the human race” [18].

Likewise, the so-called Holy Foreskin cult is a prime example of Rome's grotesque innovations. The pseudo-saint Bridget of Sweden even claimed in a vision that the Virgin Mary confirmed its preservation in Rome [19]. Instead of pointing believers to the Cross and Resurrection, such visions dragged them into carnal curiosities and fleshly fantasies. This was not the work of the Holy Spirit but of demons. A relic like this, bound up with distorted mysticism, led souls away from Christ's saving truth and into morbid superstition — just as Symeonides embodies.

What is also noteworthy about this section of his speech is that he advises those present “to kneel at their icons, to read their words” of both Orthodox and Papist saints. The irony is striking: among the Orthodox saints he lists are many who, in their writings, were vehemently anti-Catholic. This makes it clear that Symeonides is either an uneducated false teacher or a deliberate deceiver, hoping that his flock remains ignorant of the actual teachings of the Orthodox saints concerning the Latin Papists.

For example, Saint Nikodemos the Hagiorite, writing on the baptism of the Latins, declares: “We declare that the baptism of the Latins is one which falsely is called Baptism, and for this reason it is not acceptable or recognizable either on grounds of exactitude or on grounds of economy” [20]. Likewise, Saint Nikodemos writes: “Enough was said concerning them by St. Mark of Ephesus in Florence (at the twenty-fifth general assembly), who spoke frankly as follows: ‘We have split ourselves off from the Latins for no other reason than the fact that they are not only schismatics but also heretics. Wherefore we must not even think of uniting with them’” [21].

Saint Nektarios of Aegina was also vehemently opposed to Roman Catholicism, describing them as “heretics and in error” whose “arrogant and anticanonical claims concerning the primacy of the Pope of Rome... are opposed to the spirit of the one Holy Universal (Katholike) and Apostolic Church” [22].

Saint Gregory Palamas was also mentioned by Symeonides in his list of Orthodox saints to be emulated—saints whom he apparently believes would support the very heresy he is teaching. However, Saint Gregory, the staunch confessor against Barlaam and other Latin heresies, wrote in Apodictic Treatises: On the Procession of the Holy Spirit: “Into these absurdities the race of the Latins would have also fallen manifestly; had we not stripped away the greatest part of the cacodoxy by contradicting this novel dogma [*Filioque*]” [23]. Cardinal Barron later in this speech, however, treats this clear Orthodox condemnation as if it would not be a barrier to any future false union between the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Latin Papists.

At this point in his heretical confession, “Metropolitan” Symeonides continued for another thirty minutes, during which both Barron and Symeonides exchanged more pointless platitudes about their shared desire for union, all while ignoring or significantly downplaying the many doctrinal heresies that Rome has embraced: the *Filioque*, the doctrine of Purgatory, the teaching of created grace, the universal supremacy of the Pope, papal infallibility, the Immaculate Conception of Mary, transubstantiation as defined by the Latins, and the mandatory clerical celibacy imposed on priests.

This entire speech was nothing less than a confession of apostasy by yet another pseudo-bishop of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America and the Ecumenical Patriarchate. The question that must be asked, yet again, is how long will you remain in communion with—and make excuses for—this heretical patriarchate? How long will you continue in this heretical ecclesiology of “resisting within,” which is taught neither in the Scriptures, nor by the Saints and Fathers, nor in the Canons, nor in any other aspect of Orthodox Tradition?

How long will you use the excuse that the local priest does not believe this, even though he celebrates his liturgy on the Antimens signed by these same heretical bishops? How long will you use the excuse that the Ephraim monasteries do not follow these heretical bishops, while at the same time they celebrate liturgies on Antimens authorized only by the very same bishops whom even they call heretics? How much longer will you endure, and how much longer will you ignore the teaching of the Apostles, who say: “Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us” (2 Thessalonians 3:6, KJV)?

Headphones Required

---

### References

- [1]. “Presentation: 1700 Anniversary of the Council of Nicaea,” Holy Anargyroi Greek Orthodox Church – Official YouTube Channel, accessed August 31st, 2025, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=btNobkMzOXg>
- [2]. Ibid.
- [3]. Ibid.
- [4]. Subdeacon Nektarios Harrison, *The Orthodox Patristic Witness Concerning Catholicism* (Florence: Uncut Mountain Press, 2024), 233.
- [5]. Πατριάρχης Ἱεροσολύμων Δοσίθεος Β΄ (Νοταρᾶς), “Πρακτικὰ τῆς Συνελθούσης ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Συνόδου τοῦ Φωτίου, Γράφει ὁ Ἰγνάτιος ἀπὸ τὸ Πατριαρχεῖο,” στὸν Τόμο Χαράς. Μεταφρασμένο ἀπὸ τὸν Ἱερομόναχο Πολύκαρπο (Strosnider). Ἐπέξεργασία ἀπὸ τὸν Κωνσταντῖνο Σιαμάκη καὶ τὸν Γρηγόριο Χίρς. Θεσσαλονίκη: Ρηγοπούλου, 1985), 379-381. ; Ivan N. Ostroumoff, *The History of the Council of Florence* (Washington DC: Orthodox Traditionalist Publications, 2025), 171-173.
- [6]. Second canon of the Council of Antioch ap. Pitra Juris ecclesiast. Græcorum t. I. p. 457. This canon can also be found in the Explanation of the “Holy Apostolic Rules”: ibid. p. 421. “And it is unlawful to communicate with excommunicated persons [...] And, if any one of the bishops, presbyters, or deacons, or any one in the Canon shall be found communicating with excommunicated persons, let him also be excommunicated, as one who brings confusion on the order of the Church.”
- [7]. Ivan N. Ostroumoff, *The History of the Council of Florence* (Washington DC: Orthodox Traditionalist Publications, 2025), 18-20.

[8]. "Presentation: 1700 Anniversary of the Council of Nicaea," Holy Anargyroi Greek Orthodox Church – Official YouTube Channel, accessed August 31st, 2025, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=btNobkMzOXg>

Back to Top

Orthodox Traditionalist Publications, LLC, © 2025

[12]. "Protopresbyter Athanasios Nenes of the Taxiarchae Parish in Watertown to Remarry," National Herald, accessed September 1st, 2025, <https://www.thenationalherald.com/protopresbyter-athanasios-nenes-of-the-taxiarchae-parish-in-watertown-to-remarry/>

[13]. "Presentation: 1700 Anniversary of the Council of Nicaea," Holy Anargyroi Greek Orthodox Church – Official YouTube Channel, accessed August 31st, 2025, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=btNobkMzOXg>

[14]. Ibid.

[15]. Ibid.

[16]. Ibid.

[17]. Subdeacon Nektarios Harrison, *The Orthodox Patristic Witness Concerning Catholicism* (Florence: Uncut Mountain Press, 2024), 419.

[18]. Catherine Benincasa, Saint Catherine of Siena, as Seen in Her Letters, trans. and ed. Vida D. Scudder (London: J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd.; New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1911), 164.

[19]. "The Holy Prepuce: A Lesser Known Relic of Jesus Christ," uCatholic, accessed September 1st, 2025, <https://ucatholic.com/blog/the-holy-prepuce-a-lesser-known-relic-of-jesus-christ/>

[20]. Subdeacon Nektarios Harrison, *The Orthodox Patristic Witness Concerning Catholicism* (Florence: Uncut Mountain Press, 2024), 397.

[21]. Ibid., 398.

[22]. Ibid., 449-452.

[23]. Saint Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic Treaties: On the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, trans. Fr. Christopher C. Moody (Florence: Uncut Mountain Press, 2022), 59.